MEMORANDUM

TO: IUPUI Faculty Council  
Faculty/Staff of IUPUI University Library

FROM: Charles R. Bantz, Chancellor

DATE: September 26, 2014

RE: Administrative Review of the Dean, IUPUI University Library

This memo summarizes the report of the Administrative Review Committee (ARC) on the office of the Dean, IUPUI University Library David W. Lewis.

Chair Philip L. Cochran, Associate Dean, Professor of Management, IU Kelly School of Business; faculty from other schools: David M. Craig, Associate Professor, Dept. of Religious Studies, IU School of Liberal Arts, IUPUI; Nancy L. Eckerman, Librarian, Special Collections/History of Medicine, IU School of Medicine, and John C. Watson, Associate Professor, Department of Biology, Purdue School of Science, IUPUI; librarians from University Library: Heather Coates, Digital Scholarship and Data Management Libraries; Kathleen A. Hanna, Associate Librarian, Liaison to School of Physical Education and Tourism Management; Frances Ann Huehls, Special Collections; Kristi L. Palmer, Digital Scholarship/Liberal Arts, and Stephen E. Towne, Associate University Archivist, IUPUI Special Collections and Archives; professional staff: James R. Kendrick, Access Services, IUPUI University Library; Student representative JoAnn Lamb, Library and Information Science; community representative: Jackie Nytes.

The Review Process

The Survey Research Center administered two surveys to assist in the review process. One targeted faculty and staff, while the other sought feedback from undergraduate and graduate students. A survey was sent to external community members from the IUPUI University Library Community Board and the Academic Libraries of Indiana Board. Focus groups were conducted with University Library faculty and staff and faculty library liaisons. Fourteen interviews were conducted with various Indianapolis and Bloomington administrators and community leaders.

Observations

- Dean Lewis is widely credited with expressing a clear vision of the future of academic libraries and the University Library in particular. Both library staff and faculty acknowledge his understanding of the impact of new technology for staff and students.

- Dean Lewis is credited with effective financial management and administrative-level collaboration needed to implement his vision.
While considered a visionary, a significant number of University Library staff and librarians express concerns about his level of engagement and communication style—relying too heavily on the input of associate deans rather than staff at all levels.

For the most part, faculty voiced satisfaction with services, personnel and resources provided by University Library—though, some—particularly in health sciences as well as Engineering and Technology—were dissatisfied with the breadth of journals.

Community representatives surveyed also considered Dean Lewis to be a visionary leader effective in establishing, maintaining and facilitating goals and objectives. They also referred to what they consider his sometimes blunt style of communication. Overall, they praised their University Library experience.

School/department library liaisons identified two weaknesses. The first was a lack of communication with the school liaison and faculty who feel unaware of updated library resources. The second was an inability of students to use library resources effectively; suggesting that more student training should be initiated by the library staff. There was concern that the library web site may not be user-friendly for students.

The report by the school/department library liaisons praised Dean Lewis for his vision, leadership and representation of the library to the community.

There is a strong consensus among senior IUPUI administrators that Dean Lewis communicates very well at their level as well as with fellow deans.

Dean Lewis was noted to be a worthy, respected leader not only for the University Library but for IUPUI and that his sense of collaboration is an asset.

Recommendations

a. Assess the current organization structure. Consider examining best practices at peer institutions.

b. Institute formal reviews of supervisors and associate deans, encouraging open dialogue with faculty and staff, which could include reporting and follow-up procedures from reviews.

c. Be cautious of the perception of a top-down style of communications. Establish regular, inclusive and perhaps informal sessions for input on new initiatives.

d. Use existing or updated University Library Faculty Organization and University Library Staff Group structures to facilitate “bottoms-up” communication.

e. Institute exit interviews with departing full-time staff, working with Human Resources Administrative or Academic Affairs to develop appropriate procedures.